



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,919	09/30/2003	Udo Klein	16104-010001 / 2003P00683	2088
32864 7590 01/19/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			EXAMINER WONG, NOBLE S	
			ART UNIT 2173	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	01/19/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/675,919	Applicant(s) KLEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Noble S. Wong	Art Unit 2173	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amended claims filed on October 23, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-5, 8, 12-16, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McCormack et al. (US Patent # 6,243,088).

As to independent claim 1, McCormack discloses a method of successively displaying panels in a computer user interface, the method comprising:

- displaying a first panel (i.e. panel 208) of a plurality of panels (panels 206-226) in a computer user interface (i.e. application program see col. 6 line 7), each of the panels including different information (i.e. see col. 6 lines 61-67) and the computer user interface having a plurality of navigation controls (next button 250, previous button 252 and cancel button 254) by which a user can navigate to any one of the panels to access its information, wherein a first setting (i.e. task 230 then next button 250) of the navigation controls causes the first panel to be displayed (i.e. see col. 6 lines 55-60);
- receiving a user input (through input device 114 or cursor control 116) requesting access to information (i.e. see col. 6 lines 61-67) on a second panel (i.e. panel 210) in the computer user interface, there being at least two different settings of the navigation controls (next button 250 and previous button 252) that will cause the second panel to be displayed; and
- ceasing to display the first panel and displaying the second panel using one of the at least two different settings (i.e. from panel 208, clicking on next button 250) by which more of the navigation controls remain unchanged (i.e. still in task 230 see col. 6 lines 7-21) from the first setting.

As to independent claim 15, claim 15 differs from claim 1 only in that claim 15 is an apparatus claim using a computer program product (storage device 110) containing executable

instructions that when executed cause a processor (processor 104) to perform steps where as claim 1 is a method claim. Thus, claim 15 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

As to dependent claim 2, McCormack teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of panels is arranged in a hierarchy (i.e. see Fig. 2) comprising nodes (main screen 202 and panels 206-226), and wherein the panels are located at a bottom of the hierarchy (panels 212 and 226), and wherein the navigation controls (i.e. tasks 230-234) allow the user to navigate by taking different paths (i.e. see col. 6 lines 22-60) in the hierarchy of nodes.

As to dependent claim 3, McCormack teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the first setting of the navigation controls correspond to a first path (task 230 through panels 206-212) in the hierarchy of nodes and wherein the at least two settings (tasks 230-234) of the navigation controls for causing display of the second panel (panels 206 or 214) correspond to respective at least two paths (task 230 for panels 206-212 and task 232 for panels 214 to 212) in the hierarchy of paths, and wherein the one path taken to the second panel is one having a lowest common node (panel 212) with the first path taken to the first panel.

As to dependent claim 4, McCormack teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the first panel (panel 206) and the second panel (panel 214) are at a common level in the hierarchy.

As to dependent claim 5, McCormack teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the first panel (panel 206) and the second panel (panel 216) are at different levels in the hierarchy.

As to dependent claim 8, McCormack teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the user entered the information on the second panel (panel 214 by task 232) before the first panel (by

Art Unit: 2173

task 230 panel 206) was displayed, and wherein displaying the second panel provides the user access to the entered information (i.e. see col. 6 lines 61-67).

As to dependent claim 12, McCormack teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of panels is arranged in a system of nodes that does not form a tree (i.e. Fig. 2 shows nodes in a directed graph), and wherein the navigation controls allow the user to navigate by taking different paths (i.e. tasks 230 - 234) in the hierarchy of nodes.

As to dependent claim 13, McCormack teaches the method of claim 12, wherein the first setting (task 232) of the navigation controls correspond to a first path (to panel 210) in the hierarchy of nodes and wherein the at least two settings (i.e. through task 230 or task 232) of the navigation controls for causing display of the second panel (panel 212) correspond to respective at least two paths in the hierarchy of nodes, and wherein the one of the at least two paths to the second panel is used that has a common node (panel 210) with the first path to the first panel that is nearest the first panel (panel 206) (i.e. one path is through task 230 and another is through task 232. They both lead to panel 212 with a common node, panel 210).

As to dependent claim 14, McCormack teaches method of claim 13, wherein identifying (i.e. program knew that the user was on panel 218 when it is on panel 210 see col. 6 lines 29-38) the common node [, which] involves beginning with those of the nodes that are nearest the second panel in the system of nodes, and determining (i.e. see col. 6 lines 29-38) whether any of these nodes are common with any node in the first path.

As to dependent claim 16, McCormack teaches the computer program product of claim 15, wherein the plurality of panels is arranged in a hierarchy comprising nodes (i.e. see Fig. 2), and wherein the panels (panels 212 and 226) are located at a bottom of the hierarchy, and

Art Unit: 2173

wherein the navigation controls (using next button 250 and previous button 252) allow the user to navigate by taking different paths in the hierarchy of nodes wherein the first setting (task 230 to panel 210) of the navigation controls correspond to a first path in the hierarchy of nodes and wherein the at least two settings (task 230 and task 232 to panel 210) of the navigation controls for causing display of the second panel (task 232 to panel 212) correspond to respective at least two paths in the hierarchy of paths, further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to: display the second panel using the one (task 230 to panel 212) of the at least two paths that has a lowest common node with the first path taken to the first panel.

As to dependent claim 18, McCormack teaches the computer program product of claim 15, wherein the panels are arranged in a system of nodes that does not form a tree (i.e. Fig. 2 shows nodes in a directed graph), and wherein the navigation controls allow the user to navigate by taking different paths (i.e. tasks 230 - 234) in the hierarchy of nodes, further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to: begin with nodes (panel 212) nearest the second panel (through task 232 panel 212) and determine (i.e. see col. 6 lines 29-38) whether any of these nodes are common with any node in a path by which the first panel (though task 230 panel 210) was reached.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormack et al. (US Patent # 6,243,088) in view of Ulder (US Patent Application Publication # 2005/0010877).

As to dependent claim 6, McCormack teaches the method of claim 2 (see claim 2 above), but does not teach wherein the navigation controls comprise tab sets each comprising a plurality of tabs, and tab set selection tabs for selecting between the tab sets, wherein a first tab is capable of triggering display of the first panel and at least a second tab and a third tab are capable of triggering display of the second panel. Ulder teaches wherein the navigation controls comprise tab sets each comprising a plurality of tabs (plurality of tabs 218), and tab set selection tabs (application subdivision tabs 221) for selecting between the tab sets, wherein a first tab is capable of triggering display of the first panel and at least a second tab and a third tab are capable of triggering display of the second panel (i.e. "Application subdivision tabs 221 are located at the top of bottom frame 206 and provide a mechanism for tabbing between hierarchical trees within an application area," see [0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the tabs of Ulder in place of the navigational controls of McCormack to "allow structured or hierarchical data presentation" (i.e. see [0021] and [0003] to provide data to be "dynamically constructed").

As to dependent claim 7, McCormack teaches the method of claim 6 (see claim 6 above), but does not teach wherein one of the second and third tabs that is part of a common tab set with the first tab is used to display the second view. Ulder teaches wherein one of the second and third tabs that is part of a common tab set (application subdivision tabs 221) with the first tab is used

to display the second view (i.e. "Application subdivision tabs 221 are located at the top of bottom frame 206 and provide a mechanism for tabbing between hierarchical trees within an application area," see [0026]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the tabs of Ulder in place of the navigational controls of McCormack to "allow structured or hierarchical data presentation" (i.e. see [0021] and [0003] to provide data to be "dynamically constructed")

6. Claims 9, 10, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormack et al. (US Patent # 6,243,088) in view of Aiken et al. (US Patent # 6,341,359).

As to dependent claim 9, McCormack teaches the method of claim 8 (see claim 8 above), wherein the determination (i.e. see col. 6 lines 29-38) of which of the at least two settings of the navigation controls to use for displaying the second panel (panel 210), but does not teach wherein an analysis of the information entered on the second panel prompted dispatch of a message relating to the entered information, the message containing a link to the second panel, wherein activating the link triggers the determination. Aiken teaches wherein an analysis (by diagnostics see col. 9 lines 59 – col. 10 line 12) of the information (in name field 314) entered on the second panel prompted dispatch of a message (in diagnosis view 602) relating to the entered information, the message containing a link (show button 610) to the second panel (i.e. parameter dialogue box 306), wherein activating the link triggers the determination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the information analysis as taught by Aiken in place of the

Art Unit: 2173

method of McCormack to fill in “a need for a computer interface that validates user-entered data and provides the user with timely, diagnostic information on a field by field basis,” (see col. 2 lines 26-29).

As to dependent claim 10, McCormack teaches the method of claim 9 (see claim 9 above), but does not teach wherein the message is one selected from the group consisting of: an error message, a warning message, an informational message, a confirmation message, and combinations thereof. Aiken teaches wherein the message is one selected from the group consisting of: an error message, a warning message, an informational message, a confirmation message, and combinations thereof (i.e. see Fig. 6, for constraint violations col. 9 line 59 – col. 10 line 12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the information analysis as taught by Aiken in place of the determining of McCormack to fill in “a need for a computer interface that validates user-entered data and provides the user with timely, diagnostic information on a field by field basis,” (see col. 2 lines 26-29).

As to dependent claim 17, McCormack teaches the computer program product of claim 15 (see claim 15 above), further comprising instructions that when executed cause the processor to: [execute a] determination (i.e. see col. 6 lines 29-38) of which of the at least two settings of the navigation controls to use for displaying the second panel (panel 210), but does not teach that the instructions when executed cause the processor to: dispatch a message relating to information entered by the user on the second panel, the message containing a link to the second panel that when activated triggers a determination. Aiken teaches instructions that when executed cause the

Art Unit: 2173

processor to: dispatch a message (in diagnosis view 602) relating to information (in name field 314) entered by the user on the second panel (i.e. parameter dialogue box 306), the message containing a link (show button 610) to the second panel that when activated triggers a determination.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the dispatching a message relating to information as taught by Aiken in place the instructions executed by a processor of McCormack to fill in "a need for a computer interface that validates user-entered data and provides the user with timely, diagnostic information on a field by field basis," (see col. 2 lines 26-29).

7. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCormack et al. (US Patent # 6,243,088) in view of Microsoft (Windows XP, Microsoft Support Article, ID #320168).

As to dependent claim 11, McCormack teaches the method of claim 8, but does not teach wherein an application program was closed after the information was entered, and wherein the application program that includes the first and second panels is opened before receiving the request to display the second panel, wherein displaying the second panel allows the user access to the information that was entered before the application program was closed. Microsoft teaches wherein an application program (i.e. a Windows user session) that includes the first (i.e. Explorer window for folder 1) and second panels (i.e. Explorer window for folder 2) as closed (i.e. when logging off closing the user's session) when after the information (i.e. when creating a new file) was entered, and wherein the application program is opened before receiving the request to

display the second panel, wherein displaying the second panel allows the user access to the information that was entered before the application program was closed (i.e. upon logging on, Windows remembers what Explorer window was opened before the session was closed, so it can "Restore previous folder windows at logon" see Article).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used recalling of previous panels displayed as taught by Microsoft in place of the displaying of panels as taught by McCormack to view panels that were previously opened.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed on October 23, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to claims 1 and 15, as described in section **Rejections under Section 102**, Applicant argues that, "McCormack does not describe or suggest 'ceasing to display the first panel and displaying the second panel *using one of the at least two different settings by which more of the navigation controls remain unchanged from the first setting.*'" The Examiner respectfully disagrees. McCormack teaches that there are at least two different settings. A first set of navigation controls for a first panel (panel 208), one can traverse from main screen 202, through task 230 to panels 206 and 208, using the next button 250. For displaying a second panel (panel 210), there are at least two different settings to reach this panel. A first setting is using the next button 250 from panel 208 to reach 210. A second setting is using the cancel button 254 to go to the main screen 202 (see col. 6 lines 55-60). On main screen 202, the navigation controls on the

main screen are different from the ones in the panels, since main screen includes menu 204 and tasks 230, 232, and 234. Therefore, one can traverse again to panel 210 using task 230 or 232. In addition, McCormack teaches that more of the navigation controls remain unchanged from the first setting (i.e. see col. 6 lines 22-27).

As to dependent claims 2-14 and 16-18 as described in sections **Rejections under Section 102** and **Rejections under Section 103**, Applicant argues that these dependent claims should be allowable if independent claims 1 and 15 are allowable. As such, claims 1 and 15 are still rejected and therefore dependent claims 2-14 and 16-18 are currently rejected as described above.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Noble S. Wong whose telephone number is (571) 270-1044. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca can be reached on (571) 272-4048. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NSW
Noble Wong
1/9/07

Kieu Vu
Kieu Vu
Primary Examiner